

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

<b>CAROLINE MCCULLOUGH,</b>	:	<b>CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:20-CV-979</b>
	:	
<b>Plaintiff</b>	:	<b>(Judge Conner)</b>
	:	
<b>v.</b>	:	
	:	
<b>WELLSPAN YORK HOSPITAL</b>	:	
<b>and TANYA HAUGH,</b>	:	
	:	
<b>Defendants</b>	:	

**ORDER**

AND NOW, this 23rd day of February, 2021, upon consideration of the report (Doc. 17) of Magistrate Judge Martin C. Carlson, recommending that the court grant defendants’ motion (Doc. 5) to dismiss Count 7 of plaintiff’s complaint for failure to state a claim for which relief may be granted, and it appearing that plaintiff has not objected to the report, see FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b)(2), and the court noting that failure of a party to timely object to a magistrate judge’s conclusions “may result in forfeiture of *de novo* review at the district court level,” Nara v. Frank, 488 F.3d 187, 194 (3d Cir. 2007) (citing Henderson v. Carlson, 812 F.2d 874, 878-79 (3d Cir. 1987)), but that, as a matter of good practice, a district court should afford “reasoned consideration” to the uncontested portions of the report, E.E.O.C. v. City of Long Branch, 866 F.3d 93, 100 (3d Cir. 2017) (quoting Henderson, 812 F.2d at 879), in order to “satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record,” FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b), advisory committee notes, and, following an independent review of the record, the court being in agreement with Judge Carlson’s recommendation,

and concluding that there is no clear error on the face of the record, it is hereby  
ORDERED that:

1. Magistrate Judge Carlson's report (Doc. 17) is ADOPTED.
2. Defendants' motion (Doc. 5) to dismiss Count 7 of plaintiff's complaint (Doc. 1) is GRANTED.
3. Count 7 of plaintiff's complaint (Doc. 1) is DISMISSED.

/S/ CHRISTOPHER C. CONNER  
Christopher C. Conner  
United States District Judge  
Middle District of Pennsylvania